



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,322	02/14/2002	David T. Curiel	D6392	8688

7590 08-12-2003

Benjamin Aaron Adler
ADLER & ASSOCIATES
8011 Candle Lane
Houston, TX 77071

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	Q

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/075,322	CURIEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quang Nguyen, Ph.D.	1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application, and they are subjected to the following restrictions.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group Restriction:

- I. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-12, drawn to an adenoviral vector that mediates increased gene delivery *in vivo* and a method of gene delivery by the adenoviral vector, wherein the adenoviral vector comprises a targeting ligand incorporated into the fiber protein by genetic mutation, classified in class 424, subclass 93.2.
- II. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-12, drawn to an adenoviral vector that mediates increased gene delivery *in vivo* and a method of gene delivery by the adenoviral vector, wherein the adenoviral vector comprises a targeting ligand incorporated into a capsid protein of the adenoviral vector by genetic mutation, classified in class 424, subclass 93.2.
- III. Claims 1-12, drawn to an adenoviral vector that mediates increased gene delivery *in vivo* and a method of gene delivery by the adenoviral vector, wherein the adenoviral vector comprises a bispecific molecule that binds to the knob protein of the adenoviral vector and a molecule expressed on target cells, classified in class 424, subclasses 93.2, 136.1, for examples.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-12 link patentably distinct inventions of Groups I to III that lack the unity of invention. This is because the adenoviral vectors and methods of using the same in Groups I to III are distinct. The adenoviral vector of Group I contains a targeting ligand incorporated into the fiber protein of the adenoviral vector by genetic mutation, while the adenoviral vector of Group II contains a targeting ligand incorporated into a capsid protein of the adenoviral vector by genetic mutation and the adenoviral vector of Group III contains a bispecific molecule that binds to the knob protein of the adenoviral vector and a molecule express on target cells, and that the bispecific molecule is not incorporated into the adenoviral vector by genetic mutation. The methods for utilizing these different adenoviral vectors have different starting materials and therefore they require different technical considerations for achieving the desired end results (e.g., increased targeting specificity to target cells while reduced transgene expression in non-target cells). Since the operation, function and effects of these different methods are different and distinct from each other, the inventions of these different, distinct groups are capable of supporting separate patents. Additionally, as set forth in MPEP 803.02, unity of invention exists if all species recited in a claim (1) shows a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. There is no substantial structural feature shared between the adenoviral vectors of Groups I to III, particularly the adenoviral vector of Group III does not require any genetic mutation to possess an ability to increase gene delivery to target cells.

Upon the allowance of the linking claims, the restriction requirement as to the linked invention shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims or the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-132(CCPA 1971). See also MPEP 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the reasons already set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and separate search requirements (e.g., different literature searches), it would be unduly burdensome for the examiner to search and/or consider the patentability of all the inventions in a single application. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Restriction:

Should Applicants elect one of the inventions of Groups I to III, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-12 are directed to the following patentably distinct species of a tissue-specific promoter comprising:

A specifically named tissue-specific promoter recited in the Markush group of claim 5 or claim 11.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-12 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Art Unit: 1636

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (h).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang Nguyen, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-8339.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's mentor, Gerald Leffers, Jr., Ph.D., may be reached at (703) 305-6232, or SPE, Irem Yucel, Ph.D., at (703) 305-1998.

Quang Nguyen, Ph.D.

Gerald A. Leffers
PATENT EXAMINER